

APPROVED: Meeting No. 33-90

ATTEST: *Sharon A. Gran*

MAYOR AND COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
Meeting No. 32-90

July 30, 1990

The Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland, convened in Worksession in the City Manager's Conference Room, Rockville City Hall, Maryland Avenue at Vinson Street, Rockville, Maryland, on July 30, 1990, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Mayor Douglas M. Duncan

Councilmember James F. Coyle

Councilmember Viola D. Hovsepian

Councilmember David Robbins

ABSENT

Councilmember James T. Marrinan

In attendance: City Manager Bruce Romer and City Clerk Sharon Gran

Re: Worksession with
City-to-City Task Force

Robert Jaynes, Chairperson, and Task Force Members Bernice Grossman and Calvin Miller discussed the following issues with the Mayor and Council:

Appointment of Citizen Counterparts. The Task Force expressed concern that the City of Baltimore has not yet appointed counterpart citizens with whom Rockville representatives can interact to develop mutually beneficial exchanges in areas such as arts, music, literature and cultural heritage. Mayor Duncan responded that he would send letters to Mayor Schmoke and Council President Mary Pat Clarke requesting their assistance in appointing citizens to work with the Rockville Task Force. It was agreed that Bernice Grossman would contact the Greater Baltimore Committee directly to seek

Meeting No. 32-90

2

July 30, 1990

their input and assistance in facilitating an exchange program.

The successful exchanges between Rockville and Baltimore staff were mentioned. Absent the appointment of citizen representatives from Baltimore, it was agreed that Task Force members would work with City staff to perhaps expand the staff exchanges into the community. Mayor Duncan proposed that Baltimore neighborhood association leaders may provide useful contacts for the Task Force in initiating exchanges.

At 7:30 p.m., the Mayor and Council adjourned to the Council Chamber to continue to meet in worksession. In attendance were City Manager Bruce Romer, City Clerk Sharon Gran and City Attorney Paul Glasgow.

Re: Proposed Chapter 13A,
"Moderately Priced Housing"

The Mayor and Council discussed the following issues in connection with the adoption of Moderately Priced Housing.

1. Should an MPDU ordinance be adopted for Rockville given the limited opportunities for its application? The Mayor and Council noted their desire to pursue such an ordinance.

2. Should the ordinance be applicable as written in Section 13A-12 which exempts projects in which building permits have been issued, special exceptions approved, preliminary subdivision plans or special development applications approved or exploratory applications filed or should applicability be limited or expanded?

Staff noted that the MPDU ordinance would not apply to the Chestnut Lodge site or the Whalen project in Town Center. Following a description by staff as to the current status of each housing project in Rockville, it was noted that two developments in the planning stages are potential candidates for applicability of an MPDU ordinance. It was agreed by the Mayor and Council that the ordinance should be applicable as written.

Meeting No. 32-90

3

July 30, 1990

3. Should the ordinance make provision for density bonuses as has been proposed? If so, are the proposed bonuses too generous? It was agreed that density bonuses would be retained as an option although it was recognized that the possibility of density bonuses would be almost non-existent in many projects, particularly those in the Town Center or RPC Zones which are performance zones and already subject to a 15% MPDU requirement in accordance with the proposed ordinance.

4. Should a developer be able to meet its MPDU obligation by providing land, off-site MPDUs or contributions to a housing fund as currently proposed in the ordinance? Staff recommended that developers be required to show compelling reasons why an optional method should be exercised and that such an action would require final approval by the Mayor and Council.

5. Should incentives other than density be provided, i.e., waiver of fees, etc.? Councilmember Hovsepien noted that other jurisdictions waive permit fees and asked staff how much of an incentive such a waiver would provide in Rockville. Staff responded that savings in fees would approximate \$10,000 for a single-family dwelling and \$3,000 for each multi-family unit. Mayor Duncan noted that such an action would preclude the City from offsetting its service costs. Staff noted that broad flexibility should be maintained and that administrative guidelines governing the incentives would be developed.

6. Should the 50 unit threshold required for MPDU be decreased? Staff recommended, and the Mayor and Council agreed, that the 50 unit threshold be maintained but that options such as waiving fees for desirable developments under 50 units be considered as a means to encourage MPDU production.

7. Should the Director of Community Development or the City Manager be permitted to make discretionary decisions in administering an MPDU ordinance or should that responsibility be retained by the Planning Commission and/or the Mayor and Council?

It was agreed that revisions to the proposed ordinance as well as the administrative procedures would delineate the decision making responsibility with staff making decisions which are ministerial in nature and decisions on substantive and policy issues such as density bonuses being reserved for the Mayor and Council.

8. Should the RHA be designated as a housing agency or should the term housing agency be more generic? It was agreed that a generic term "designated housing agency" would be used which would not preclude the Rockville Housing Authority from being designated for a particular project.

9. Should the MPDU covenants be extended beyond 10 years? Staff noted that the County's legislation provides for an equity share for the second ten-year period. The Mayor and Council agreed to use a 20-year term with a sliding scale equity share to be used for the second ten-year period.

10. Should the housing fund goals and parameters be created before the applicability of the MPDU ordinance? The Mayor and Council agreed that this was not necessary but that they should be provided as soon as possible.

11. Should administrative procedures be in place before the adoption of the MPDU ordinance? Again, the Mayor and Council agreed that this was not necessary but that administrative procedures should be brought forth quickly.

12. When will the ordinance become effective? Staff was instructed to make the necessary changes to the proposed ordinance for adoption at the meeting of September 10, 1990.

Councilmember Hovsepian referenced a pressing housing need in the City, that is, the need for group homes for women on the streets, and asked how the City can respond. Mayor Duncan noted that this issue could be discussed in the context of how the housing fund would be used.

Meeting No. 32-90

5

July 30, 1990

Staff concluded the worksession by showing the Mayor and Council a map of the City illustrating all of the parcels of land available for housing.

Re: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Mayor and Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m., to convene again in General Session at 7:30 p.m. on August 6, 1990, or at the call of the Mayor.